



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,227	04/09/2001	Mark E. Brewster	SMQ-063 (P5742)	8606

959 7590 09/10/2004

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/829,227

Applicant(s)

BREWSTER ET AL.

Examiner

Tammy T Nguyen

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/16/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENT
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the application 09/829,227 filed. **April 9, 2001.**
2. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John E. Pavlov, (hereinafter Pavlov) U.S. Patent No. 6,725,426 in view of Hyman et al., (hereinafter Hyman) U.S. Patent No. 6,772,395.
5. As to claim 1, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, including in a computer network, said network interfaced with a server, a method for collecting and presenting data, said method comprising the steps of: receiving a first document, said first document submitted by a first user (col.1, lines 12-38); automatically converting data extracted from said first document into an

extensible markup language (XML) document (col.1, lines 45-55, and col.2, lines 45-50); storing said XML document on said server (col.3, lines 25-40); and access of said XML document from a remote location connected to said network by a second user (col.3, lines 60-67, and col.4, lines 30-40). But Pavlov does not teach permitting access to the XML document from a remote location. However, Hyman teaches permitting access document from a remote location (col.6, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pavlov and Hyman to have permitting access to the XML document from a remote location because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to be determined if the sender or accessing person is indeed authorized to transmit or access documents.

6. As to claim 3, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is said second user (col.2, line 60 to col.3, line 5).
7. As to claim 4, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is different from said second user (col.4, lines 54-60).
8. As to claim 5, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: providing a stylesheet; and applying said stylesheet to said XML document in response to commands from said second user (col.3, lines 60-67).
9. As to claim 6, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, comprising the further step of: storing said XML document in a database connected to said network (col.3, lines 24-40).

10. As to claim 7, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said second user retrieves said XML document from said database (col.3, lines 30-40).
11. As to claim 8, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: providing an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) stylesheet; and applying said XSL stylesheet to said XML document in response to commands from said second user (col.3, lines 59-67).
12. As to claim 9, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, including in a computer network, said network interfaced with a database, a method for collecting and presenting data, said method comprising the steps of: receiving a first document, said first document submitted by a first user (col.1, lines 12-38); automatically converting data extracted from said first document into an extensible markup language (XML) document (col.1, lines 45-55, and col.2, lines 45-50); storing said XML document in said database (col.3, lines 30-40);
~~and access of said XML document from a remote location connected to said~~
network by a second user (col.3, lines 60-67, and col.4, lines 30-40). But
~~Pavlov does not teach permitting access to the XML document from a remote~~
location. However, Hyman teaches permitting access document from a remote location (col.6, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pavlov and Hyman to have permitting access to the XML document from a remote location because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to be determined if the sender or accessing person is indeed authorized to transmit or access documents.

13. As to claim 11, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is said second user (col.2, line 60 to col.3, line 5).
14. As to claim 12, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is different from said second user (col.4, lines 54-60).
15. As to claim 13, Pavlov the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: providing a stylesheet; and applying the stylesheet to said XML document in response to commands from said second user (col.3, lines 59-67).
16. As to claim 14, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said stylesheet is an XSL stylesheet (col.3, lines 59-67).
17. As to claim 15, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, including in a computer network, said network including a server interfaced with a database, a medium holding computer-executable instructions for a method of collecting and displaying data, said method comprising the steps of: receiving a first document, said first document submitted from a first user (col.1, lines 12-38); automatically converting data extracted from said first document into an XML (col.1, lines 45-55, and col.2, lines 45-50); storing said XML document in said database(col.3, lines 30-40); and access of said XML document from a remote location connected to said network by a second user (col.3, lines 60-67, and col.4, lines 30-40). But Pavlov does not teach permitting access to the XML document from a remote location. However, Hyman teaches permitting access document from a remote location (col.6, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pavlov and Hyman to have permitting

access to the XML document from a remote location because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to be determined if the sender or accessing person is indeed authorized to transmit or access documents.

18. As to claim 17, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is different from said second user (col.2, line 60 to col.3, line 5).
19. As to claim 18, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the method comprises the additional steps of: providing a stylesheet; and applying the stylesheet to said XML document in response to commands from said second user (col.3, lines 59-67).
20. As to claim 19, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the stylesheet provided by said method is an XSL stylesheet (col.3, lines 5-67).
21. As to claim 20, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, including in a computer network, said network including a server, a medium holding computer-executable instructions for a method, said method comprising the steps of: receiving a first document, said first document submitted from a first user (col.1, lines 12-38); automatically converting data extracted from said first document into an XML document (col.1, lines 45-55, and col.2, lines 45-50); storing said XML document on said server (col.3, lines 30-40); and access of said XML document from a remote location connected to said network by a second user (col.3, lines 60-67, and col.4, lines 30-40). But Pavlov does not teach permitting access to the XML document from a remote location. However, Hyman teaches permitting access document from a

remote location (col.6, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pavlov and Hyman to have permitting access to the XML document from a remote location because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to be determined if the sender or accessing person is indeed authorized to transmit or access documents.

22. As to claim 22, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is said second user (col.2, line 60 to col.3, line 5).
23. As to claim 23, Pavlov teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said recipient is different from said second user (col.2, line 60 to col.3, line 5).
24. Claims 2, 10, 16, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John E. Pavlov., (hereinafter Pavlov) U.S. Patent No. 6,725,426 Hyman et al., (hereinafter Hyman) U.S. Patent No. 6,772,395 in view of Erez Halahmi., (hereinafter Halahmi) U.S. Patent No. 6,684,088.
25. As to claim 21, Pavlov and Hyman do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein said method comprising the additional step of: automatically emailing said XML document to a recipient, said recipient indicated by said first user. However, Halahmi teaches automatically emailing said XML document to a recipient, said recipient indicated by said first user (col.6, lines 10-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pavlov, Hyman and Halahmi

to have emailing XML document to a recipient because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to send automatically emailing XML document to recipient.


26. Claims 2, 10, 16 have similar limitations as claim 21; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

27. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Bill Cuchlinski, may be reached at **(703) 308-3873**.

TTN
September 1, 2004


WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000